



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,809	04/15/2004	Cliff Daniel Cyphers	AUS920040045US1	6688
35525	7590	03/20/2009		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER WANG, JUE S	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/20/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeciipaw.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/824,809

**Applicant(s)**

CYPHERS, CLIFF DANIEL

**Examiner**

JUE S. WANG

**Art Unit**

2193

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claim 21 has been examined.
2. Claims 2-20 were cancelled in Amendment dated 6/17/2008.
3. Claim 21 was cancelled in Amendment dated 12/3/2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following claim language is indefinite and not clear:

- i. Claim 21, lines 10-12, recites, “creating an updated plurality of files by accepting a user specification of a file ..., searching the file ... for each occurrence of the old value, and replacing each occurrence of the old value with the new value”. This limitation is not clearly understood because it is not clear how specifying a file to be searched and replaced would result in an updated plurality of files, i.e., is the user specification of a file performed multiple times or can the user specify more than one file at a time within which to search for the old value to be replaced with the new value?

Appropriate corrections are required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy et al. (US 7,069,553 B2, hereinafter Narayanaswamy), in view of Sommerer, "The Java Archive (JAR) File Format", further in view of Chan et al. (US 6,633,892 B1, hereinafter Chan), further in view of Jackson (US 6,920,630 B2).

8. As per claim 21, Narayanaswamy teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for updating an original plurality of files within an original archive file, (see column 2, lines 38-41, column 5, lines 57-63) comprising:

using a computer having a processor and a memory connected to the processor, storing a program in the memory of the computer, the program adapted to cause the processor to perform steps comprising (see column 3, lines 35-46):

recording an order and an arrangement of the original archive file in a structure file (see Fig 7, column 6, lines 36-39, and column 16, lines 38-44; EN: the JAR file structure must be recorded since EJB display tree containing the JAR file structure is displayed);

decompressing the plurality of original files within the archive file (i.e., one or more deployment descriptors in the EAR file may be extracted and modified, see Fig 7, Fig 8, column 6, lines 36-48, and column 8, lines 39-42);

creating an updated plurality of files by accepting a specification of an old value and a new value (see column 7, lines 9-10, column 8, lines 37-53, column 11, lines 7-41, “A string that may need to be replaced” is the old value and “the replacement string” is the new value); searching for the each occurrence of the old value, and replacing each occurrence of the old value with the new value (see column 8, lines 37-49, “The checkForStart and CheckForEnd methods of the Replacer interface are called to locate the beginning and end of the string that may need to be replaced”); and

compressing the updated plurality of files into the archive file according to the order and the arrangement stored in the structure file (see column 7, lines 58-61 and column 8, lines 12-16; EN: the EAR file is repackaged with the modified deployment descriptors where the JAR file content must be archived according to the original JAR file structure since only the deployment descriptors are modified).

Narayanaswamy does not explicitly teach that the old value and the new value are specified by the user. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the old value and the new value can be specified by the user since the purpose of the invention was to provide the user with a series of input tools or panels for specifying deployment variables and customizing the deployment as needed (see abstract, lines 6-8, column 5, lines 23-35, and column 8, lines 37-47), therefore, providing the user with a search and replace functionality that is already available via the Replacer interface (see column

8, lines 37-53, column 11, lines 7-41) allows the user to edit the deployment descriptors in a more efficient manner.

Narayanaswamy does not explicitly state that the order and the arrangement of is the same before and after the updated plurality of files are created. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the method of modifying the deployment descriptors as taught by Narayanaswamy would yield an EAR file where the order and arrangement remains the same. Sommerer teaches that when extracting JAR files, the directory structure that the files have in the archive is reproduced (see section "Using JAR Files: the Basics Extracting Contents a JAR file", page 1, paragraph 1), and when creating JAR files, the files in the archive retain their relative pathnames and directory structure (see section "Using JAR Files: the Basics Creating a JAR file", page 2, paragraph 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary art that the order and arrangement of the EAR file would remain the same before and after the modification of the deployment files because Narayanaswamy only teaches modifying the content of existing deployment descriptors and does not teach performing any modification that would otherwise modify the order of the files, therefore, the directory structure of the expanded components would be the same as the original EAR file since Sommerer teaches that the directory structures are reproduced when the JAR file is unpacked and the newly packaged EAR file with the modified deployment descriptors are based on the current directory structure which is the same as the reproduced directory structure.

Narayanaswamy does not teach creating a temporary directory and copying an archive file into the temporary directory.

Chan teaches a deployment tool that creates a temporary directory and copies an archive file into the temporary directory to be processed (see Fig 3, column 7, lines 10-14, 31-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Narayanaswamy to create a temporary directory and copy the archive file into the temporary directory as taught by Chan because it provides a temporary working directory for working with the input Jar file (see column 7, lines 31-40, column 7, lines 66 – column 7, lines 15 of Chan).

Narayanaswamy and Chan do not teach accepting user specification of a file of the plurality of files and a field, searching the field in the file, and wherein the field is an application configuration information position within the archive file content.

Jackson teaches a resource bundle manager for editing application configuration information (i.e., resource information, see column 1, lines 49-55, column 4, lines 45-59), including a search function which accepts user specification of a file of a plurality of files and a field, searching the field in the file, wherein the field is an application configuration information position within the archive file content (see Fig 12, column 8, lines 28-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Narayanaswamy, Sommerer, and Chan to accept user specification of a file of the plurality of files and a field, searching the field in the file, and wherein the field is an application configuration information position within the archive file content as taught by Jackson because it provides context to guide the search and provide an option to the user to search over one particular file (see column 8, lines 35-42 of Jackson).

***Response to Arguments***

9. Rejection of claims under §103(a):

10. **Section II.B. of Arguments:**

Applicants argued that “The Examiner appears to argue that modifying a deployment descriptor and placing it in an EAR file is the same as modifying files in an archive file. ... However, archiving involves compressing and decompressing files in claim 21, then creating a new archive file with the same order and arrangement as the original archive file. ... The cited references are silent as to the order and arrangement remaining the same.”

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the arguments presented in this section. First, the Examiner submits that an EAR file is an archive file that involves compressing and decompressing. As is well known in the art and stated by Narayanaswamy, an EAR file is a Java archive (JAR) file format file with a ear file extension (see column 6, lines 1-3 of Narayanaswamy). In addition, a JAR file is an archive that involves compression and decompression as is well known in the art and described in Sommerer (section “Using JAR Files: the Basics”, page 1, paragraph 1). Second, Examiner submits that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the method of modifying the deployment descriptors as taught by Narayanaswamy would yield an EAR file where the order and arrangement remains the same. Narayanaswamy teaches expanding the EAR file into its individual components so that one or more deployment descriptors in the EAR file may be extracted and modified (see column 6, lines 36-39). Sommerer teaches that when extracting JAR files, the directory structure that the files have in the archive is reproduced (see section “Using JAR Files: the Basics Extracting Contents a JAR file”, page 1, paragraph 4). Narayanaswamy teaches the contents of deployment



descriptors are edited and the EAR file is repackaged with the modified deployment descriptor (see column 7, lines 9-10, column 16, lines 38-63). Sommerer teaches that when creating JAR files, the files in the archive retain their relative pathnames and directory structure (see section “Using JAR Files: the Basics Creating a JAR file”, page 2, paragraph 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary art that the order and arrangement of the EAR file would remain the same before and after the modification of the deployment files because Narayanaswamy only teaches modifying the content of existing deployment descriptors and does not teach performing any modification that would otherwise modify the order of the files, therefore, the directory structure of the expanded components would be the same as the original EAR file since Sommerer teaches that the directory structures are reproduced when the JAR file is unpacked and the newly packaged EAR file with the modified deployment descriptors are based on the current directory structure which is the same as the reproduced directory structure.

**11. Section II.C. of Arguments:**

Applicant's arguments in this section have been fully considered and Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Narayanaswamy's method of modifying deployment descriptors does not alter the order and arrangement of the plurality of files as per the reasons given above in the response to Section II.B.

**12. Section II.D. of Arguments:**

Applicant argued that Narayanaswamy is silent as to recording an order and arrangement of the original archive file in a structure file in a temporary directory. Examiner submits that the order and arrangement of the original archive file is recorded when the EAR file is expanded into its individual components because Sommerer teaches reproducing the directory structure when extracting files from a JAR file, so the file system must record the reproduced directory structure for bookkeeping. In addition, Narayanaswamy teaches displaying the EAR file structure including the deployment descriptors to be modified (see Fig 7, column 16, lines 38-44), therefore, there must be a record of the file structure in order for the file structure to be displayed.

Applicant argued that Chan's "temporary directory" is not the same as the temporary directory of claim 21 because it is permissive by virtue of the word "may" and Chan's temporary directory is destined for an input.jar file. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this. Examiner submits that in teaching the use of a temporary directory to work with input JAR files to create an output JAR file (see Fig 3, column 7, lines 10-14, 31-40), Chan remedies the deficiency of Narayanaswamy of not using a temporary directory by teaching that a temporary directory could be used when processing a JAR file to create a new JAR file, similar to the operation of Narayanaswamy which processes a EAR file to create a new EAR file with modified deployment descriptors.

**13. Section II.E. of Arguments:**

Applicant argued that Narayanaswamy is silent as to "decompressing the plurality of original files within the archive file to the temporary directory". Examiner submits that

Narayanaswamy teaches decompressing the plurality of original files within the archive file in teaching expanding the EAR file into its individual components so that one or more deployment descriptors in the EAR file may be extracted and modified (see column 6, lines 36-39 of Narayanaswamy) because an EAR file is a JAR format file (see column 6, lines 1-3 of Narayanaswamy) and JAR files are compressed and decompressed (see section “Using JAR Files: the Basics”, page 1, paragraph 1 of Sommerer). Narayanaswamy does not explicitly teach a temporary directory and Chan is cited to remedy this deficiency.

**14. Section II.F. of Arguments:**

Applicant argued that Jackson does not disclose creating an updated plurality of files by searching for a value and then replacing each occurrence of the value. Examiner submits that Jackson is not cited to teach this limitation. Rather, Narayanaswamy is cited to teach creating an updated plurality of files by searching for a value and then replacing each occurrence of the value (see column 8, lines 37-53, column 11, lines 7-41). Jackson was cited to teach the deficiency of Narayanaswamy: a user specification of a file of the plurality of files and searching the old value in the file and field.

**15. Section II.G. of Arguments:**

The arguments in this section are similar to those in section II.B. and Examiner finds the arguments in this section non-persuasive as per the reasons given above for section II.B.

**16. Section II.H. of Arguments:**

Applicant argued that the statements made by the Examiner does not provide reasons as required in the Supreme Court guidance on combining references in the KSR case. Instead, the Examiner has only provided statements that are conclusory or reciting some desired goal. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. Examiner submits that the references are combined using the rational of using known techniques to improve similar devices (method, or products) in some way (see MPEP 2143, Exemplary Rationales) and the obviousness statements are provided by the examiner to provide reasons why the combination would improve the method.

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jue S. Wang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Jue Wang  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2193